

REMARKS

Claims 1-12, 14-17, 29 and 30 are pending in the present application.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 15-19, 21, 22 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Galvez et al. ("Networking, Videoconferencing and Collaborative Environments," 1998) (cited as reference V in the PTO-892 of 8/25/2004) in view of Tucker et al. (US 6,590,604).

With regard to claims 1 and 16, Galvez discloses a virtual room videoconferencing system for transporting packets of videoconferencing data (Fig 3), comprising:

a first and second computing device (Fig 3, 1 and 5);

a first reflector (Fig 3,3) connected to said first computing device and a second reflector (Fig 3, "Reflector") coupled to said second computing device;

a video conference web server that is not a reflector coupled to said first and second computing devices and enabling the first and second computing devices to participate in a virtual room video conference (at least Page 7)

a communication path formed between the first and second reflectors for communicating video conference data (Fig 3, "Tunnel").

Galvez fails to specifically disclose that the first and second computing devices use different protocols or a gateway coupled to the server and enabled by the server to contact the first computing device.

Tucker discloses a similar system for videoconferencing (Col 2, Lines 46-54) and teaches the use of a gateway (Fig 7,708) to enable conferencing using a first protocol (H.323) (Col 9, Lines 50-54) and a computing device (H.320 gateway) coupled to multiple clients for enabling conferencing between the clients independent of their differing protocols (Col 9, Lines 55-63). These would have been an advantageous addition to the system disclosed by Galvez since it would have allowed various clients using different protocols to conference with each other without requiring the clients to change any settings or software.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use gateways to enable conferencing using a first protocol, such as H.320.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. The “server” described in the Galvez reference is not a web server but is a client computer using a web browser interface. The reference speaks of access to tool of the LBNL videoconferencing applications suite, and the use of a Web-based interface to provide a schedule manager, DNS with point and click option to initiate a videoconference, Administrators interface and documentation. All of the services described in section 5 of the reference are at client computers and not at server computers. By contrast, the present application discloses and claims video conference web servers that are not client devices but which are found in the video conference network itself. What is described in section 5 is what the user will see in their browser. It does not describe the web server itself and how it manages and establish the collaboration session. As noted in the amended independent claims, the videoconference web server provides network connections and control of the reflectors, in addition to receiving connection requests from the client computers.

Claims 9-12 and 24-17 *[sic]* are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Galvez et al. in view of Tucker et al. (US 6,590,604) in further view of DeGollado et al. (US 6,411,623).

With regard to claims 9 and 24, Galvez discloses a virtual room videoconferencing system (Fig 3) comprising:

a first and second computing device (Fig 3, 1 and 2);

a first reflector connected to said first and second computing devices (Fig 3, 3);

a video conference web server that is not a reflector coupled to said first and second computing devices and enabling the first and second computing devices to participate in a virtual room vide conference (at least page 7).

However, Galvez fails to specifically disclose a first encoder/decoder box connected to the first computing device for encoding/decoding video conference data for the first computing device using said first protocol or a third computing device connected to said first and second computing devices for enabling conferencing independent of the first and second protocols.

Tucker discloses a similar system for videoconferencing (Col 2, Lines 46-54) and teaches the use of a computing device (H.320 gateway) coupled to multiple clients for enabling conferencing between the clients independent of their differing protocols (Col 9, Lines 55-63). These would have been an advantageous addition to the system disclosed by Galvez since it would have allowed various clients using different protocols to conference with each other without requiring the clients to change any settings or software.

DeGollado also discloses a similar system for distribution of audio/video data (Col 5, Lines 44-46). DeGollado teaches using a first encoder/decoder box connected to a first and second computing device and a second encoder/decoder box connected to a third computing device (Col 6, Lines 14-36 and Fig 2). This allows the video signals from each device to be encoded for transfer over the network and decoded by the receiving devices.

Therefore, it would have, been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use gateways to enable conferencing using a first protocol, such as H.320, and a third computing device for enabling conferencing between clients independent of their differing protocols.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. For the reasons stated above, the cited combination does not teach, describe, or suggest an element of the independent claims, namely the video conference server.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, applicants respectfully request that this application be reexamined and that the claims, as amended, be allowed.

Applicants also file concurrently herewith a PETITION FOR EXTENSION of time to extend the due date for response to the outstanding OFFICE ACTION until December 6, 2007.

Please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 07-1896.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 4, 2007



J.D. Harriman II, Reg. 31,967

DLA Piper US LLP
1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 400
Los Angeles, California 90067-6023
Tel: (310) 595-3000
Fax: (310) 595-3300